

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/777,254	02/12/2004	Michael R. S. Hill	P-9485.05	5396
²⁷⁵⁸¹ MEDTRONIC,	7590 01/11/200 INC.	7	EXAMINER	
710 MEDTRONIC PARK MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55432-9924			SMITH, TERRI L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3762	
		··	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
31 D	AYS	01/11/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	<u> </u>			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary	10/777,254	HILL ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Terri L. Smith	3762		
eriod for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time Till apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status		•		
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 Fe This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E 	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-39 are subject to restriction and/or expressions.				
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the orange Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the orange replacement or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 12. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 13. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 14. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 15. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 16. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 17. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 18. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner 19. **The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner is objected to by the Examiner is objected to be a control in the oath of the oath or declaration is objected to be a control in the oath of the	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage		
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite		
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) LJ Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/777,254 Page 2

Art Unit: 3762

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1–11, drawn to a method, classified in class 607, subclass 4.
 - II. Claims 12–19, drawn to a device, classified in class 607, subclass 7.
 - III. Claims 20–30, drawn to a method, classified in class 607, subclass 4.
 - IV. Claims 31–39, drawn to a device, classified in class 607, subclass 124.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

- 2. Inventions of Groups I and III (processes) and Groups II and IV (apparatuses) are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another and materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process such as not requiring reducing esophageal and endotracheal stimulation of the vagal nerve, but rather maintaining a steady stimulation on the SA node.
- Inventions of Group I (combination) and Group III (subcombination) are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination (Group I) as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination (Group III) as claimed because Group I

Art Unit: 3762

does not require endotracheal stimulation of a vagal nerve. The subcombination has separate utility such as not requiring esophageal stimulation of a vagal nerve, but rather directly stimulating the heart.

4. Inventions of Group II (combination) and Group IV (subcombination) are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination (Group II) as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination (Group IV) as claimed because Group II does not require an endotracheal nerve stimulation electrode. The subcombination has separate utility such as not requiring an esophageal nerve stimulation electrode arranged on an esophageal tube, but rather a pacing electrode placed in the right ventricle.

The Examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where Applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

5. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required because the

Application/Control Number: 10/777,254

Art Unit: 3762

inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. A telephone call was made to Jeff Hohenshell on Thursday, January 4, 2007 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should Applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, Applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the Examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

7. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Art Unit: 3762

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Terri L. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-7146. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, between 7:30 a.m. - 4:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 571-272-4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TLS

January 4, 2007

January 2007

ANGELA D. SYKES

Cingel, D. Aspe

SUPERVISOR

TECHNOL.